

**STATE COMMITTEE OF INTERPRETERS
DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION
3605 MISSOURI BOULEVARD
Jefferson City, Missouri**

JANUARY 24, 2003 -- OPEN MINUTES

The open session of the State Committee of Interpreters was called to order by Lisa Guillory, Acting Chairperson, at 10:30am at the Division of Professional Registration, 3605 Missouri Blvd, Jefferson City, Missouri. It should be noted that Lisa Guillory was Acting Chairperson due to Loretto Durham participating via conference call.

Members Present:

Loretto Durham, Chairperson (via conference call)
Carrie McCray, Secretary
John Adams
Sandy Drummond
Lisa Guillory
Kim McEnulty

Staff Present:

Pam Goose, Executive Director
Roxy Brockman, Clerk IV
Tammy Mouden, Licensing Technician II
Shannon Hamilton, Assistant Attorney General
Trisha Chapin, Contract Interpreter
Peggy Withrow, Contract Interpreter
Marilyn Taylor Williams, Division Director / PR
Becky Kilpatrick, Regulatory Council for Dept of Econ Dev and Div of Prof Reg

Visitors Present:

Susen McBeth, FVCC
Kandice Allee, MCDHH
Dan Betzler, FVCC
Lisa Betzler, FVCC
Dr. Roy Miller, MCDHH
Alex Miller, LEAD Institute
Janice Cobb, LEAD Institute
Kathleen Alexander, CIS
Stephanie Logan, LEAD Institute
Becky Beck, LEAD Institute
Jennifer Martin, FVCC

A motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. McEnulty to go into closed session at 10:30am for #1, #2, #3, and #9. Ms. Drummond, Mr. Adams, Ms. McEnulty, Ms. Durham and Dr. Guillory all approved.

Review and Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms McEnulty to approve the open agenda. All approved

Review and Approval of Open Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. McCray to approve the open minutes from the December 4, 2002 as amended. All approved.

Statutes

-209.323 (HB1783) – Review of MCDHH guidelines for converting. The following is a comprehensive reporting of the discussion regarding the review of the MCDHH guidelines for converting skill levels.

Dr. Guillory -- 209.323 (House Bill 1783 is a review of MCDHH's guidelines for converting skill levels from national certification to the MICS certification. Since I am not an interpreter I cannot open this discussion. I want to make sure this is what Dr Miller sent to you in your request. In here there is a letter from Pam to MCDHH about this.

Mr. Adams -- In the packet of information that I gave you guys there are definitions of the RID levels. One page is current levels that RID uses and the 2nd page are levels that are no longer offered. Granted, that on the first page the CSC is no longer offered but there are many people that still hold that certificate. If you're interested I do have the numbers of CDI and the IC/TC, the IC, and the TC certificates of how many people in the country are currently holding those 4 score certificates if you want the actual numbers. For the three on the 2nd page that just say approximately 500, but I do have a breakdown of those actual certificates. For the IC by itself, 37 holders of that certificate, for the TC by itself there are 94, and for the combined IC/TC there are 339, for a total of 470. There are 108 CDI holders across the country. I found this information and thought since we'd be discussing it, between this, the guidelines we receive from the BCI for converting, that this might aid us in our discussion.

Ms. Drummond – I just wanted to clarify why we're talking about this on the agenda today, and Kim wasn't at the last meeting. About the fact that House Bill 1783 went into effect saying that certain RID certifications and NAD certifications are considered to be recognized by the BCI and go directly to licensure, and so I raised the question at the last meeting, how are we supposed to interpret those certifications when maybe a complaint is filed about not providing competent service? They're not listed anywhere in the requisite skill levels, and how should handle that? At the last meeting we asked the BCI to send us their conversion policy so we could look at that and get idea of how to do that. We also talked about getting together and working with the BCI on a project like that, at the last meeting the BCI had not yet set a meeting. That is another avenue that we couldwe don't necessarily have to make decisions today. We can go to the BCI and talk to them about how would they like us to handle this, that sort of thing. That's what we were talking about at the last meeting and that's why it is on the agenda today.

Dr. Guillory -- I'm not quite clear on this. These are proposed conversions and all we wanted to do was see what they were. In terms of the conversions, regardless if we're talking about what you wrote or what came from MCD, was the purpose of this discussion just to look at what those conversions might be, or is it actually to take action in some way, because that's not under our law.

Ms. McCray – I think these are the conversions. So if someone goes to MCDHH with a CI/CT, this is what it would be converted under the MICS system. So we can see if someone with RID bypasses MCDHH, which technically they can, that way we can see where they fit in the skill level standards.

Dr. Guillory – In order to determine if they have practiced in a situation that was above their skill level?

Ms. McCray – That's my understanding.

Ms. Goose – The first issue is how to license them. The second issue would be if they are licensed and there's a complaint, but the first in the discussion....is how to license.

Dr. Guillory – ...Of how to license these people. Then what we need is something in our rules to address this, is that the action that needs to be taken? The statute is already there, and so we need something in our rules to address this. But we have no proposed language yet? I just wasn't clear on where we were. Remember, I got elected to do this 20 minutes ago.

Ms. Goose – Part of the decision of the last meeting was that there be a joint meeting of BCI and this committee.

Dr. Guillory -- Right, and to my knowledge the BCI did not meet last week and are they meeting on the 29th? Let me ask that question now. Is the BCI meeting on the 29th?

Dr. Miller -- Next Friday, the 31st.

Dr. Guillory -- That's not a lot of time and we were trying to get a joint meeting together, right?

Ms. Goose -- We had given suggested dates but what we don't know, is that's a BCI meeting, that's not the joint meeting, and is that going to be on their agenda?

Dr Miller -- I don't think that's been settled, when I sent out the notice asking for a joint meeting and suggesting the two dates that you had given us, the response in general was that some people could not make either one of those dates. The BCI historically meets on a Friday and two of the members would like to continue, because they've got other responsibilities. They didn't say no to a joint meeting, what they said was we can't meet on those two dates and to go ahead and set up our meeting for Friday the 31st. I have the feeling they would probably be receptive to a joint meeting on Friday the 31st or some other Friday.

Dr. Guillory - So our two choices are that we are able to go and participate in a joint meeting on the 31st or we ask them for dates in the future where we could get together on a Friday and have a joint meeting. Well let's answer the first question. Can these committee members be there next Friday the 31st?

Ms. Drummond -- I can

Ms. McCray -- I can't

Ms. Durham -- I cannot

Mr. Adams -- I don't know if I can or not yet.

Ms. McEnulty -- I can't

Dr. Guillory -- Okay, so Loretta can't, John's not sure, we aren't actually voting on anything, we're just there for info purposes, so Loretta if you can't be there, is that okay with you?

Ms. Durham -- This meeting has to take place. I can't help it that I can't be there, so yes, please, you guys go.

Dr. Guillory -- Okay..and John? That's fine with you?

Mr. Adams -- yes

Dr. Guillory -- Then Dr Miller would you let Pam know for sure if we have some time allocated to discuss this issue all together?

Dr Miller -- I can do that. I'm sure that they'll set aside a particular time and that will be convenient for you. They will have a closed session for some other purposes in the morning, so I can tell you that it will be in the afternoon some time.

Dr. Guillory -- Is there any other discussion about that? Do we need further discussion about the skill levels?

Ms. Drummond -- About the skill levels, no. Just about how to do the licensing. I remember at the last meeting we discussed that the application doesn't have a place for them to check if they have something other than MICS certification. So we just need to make a change to the application. Is there anything else that we need to do in order to get that process in place?

Ms. Goose -- Just modify the application.

Dr. Guillory -- Do you need a motion for that or you can just do it?

Ms. Goose -- No, we can just do that. Is your intent to license without a rule in place?

Dr. Guillory -- I just hadn't gotten there yet.

Ms. Drummond – Without a rule in place, do you mean without a rule for converting? Don't we have to?

Ms. Goose -- We have to license? Yes, I think so.

Mr. Adams – That's what the law says.

Ms. Goose – Right, but that was the question at the last meeting though, at what level are we going to license them at, so if we add that to an application and we get that in, what are we going to do? At what level are we going to license them?

Ms. Drummond – We don't have to decide level that they are licensed at. We just need this information to help us if we need to process complaints about skills and things like that. I'm assuming that on their license card, it would say RID, CI/CT or NAD5 or CDI or something like that.

Ms. Goose – If that's what you want that can happen next week.

Ms. Drummond – That's what I was assuming would happen.

Mr. Adams – That's what I was assuming too. But the skill level standards, we'll have to decide on that.

Ms. Goose – It's a guideline in the event of a complaint, not

Mr. Adams – Say an NAD3 goes to the emergency room, do we say that's completely appropriate, that's inappropriate, that's why we need the skill level standards, to know how it equates in to our??. But as far as licensing we don't have much choice on that it's in the law.

Dr. Guillory – So we can't actually have discussion about any language for a rule that has to do with practicing beyond your skill level until we meet and discuss this with the BCI? Is that right?

Ms. Drummond – No, I don't think so.

Dan Betzler – If I can be recognized as a BCI member, the statutes say they do not have to approach BCI at all. All of our negotiations were done prior to the statute, during that time period we were negotiating on how to convert, the statute was then put in place, which said they could just jump over the BCI or MCDHH and come right to you for a license. So the meeting next week would be just to explain how we came up with the conversionary process. It really doesn't matter. You could decide something on your own, take into consideration our recommendations or not. But it's basically to give you the reasoning behind why came up with this conversionary process, because we had already put it in our rules prior to the statute. So at the last meeting Sandy and I were discussing that perhaps you all can gain some knowledge as to why we chose to do it the way we did in regards to giving it some equivalence with the MICS. Does that make sense?

Dr. Guillory – Okay. Thank you. I think so. So then we don't need any action right now with regard to changes in our rules. No? Okay, just making sure. Any more discussion about that?

-209.285 (13) & (15)

Dr. Guillory -- Okay the next thing is 209.285 and this is in regard to paragraphs 13 and 15, definitions of interpreter and interpreting.

Ms. Goose – There's an indication that there is a memo from Shannon Hamilton. However that is not included, the memo was attorney-client privilege information.

Dr. Guillory - So our public members don't have the memo from the Assistant AG but we still wanted to have discussion. The reason we were discussing these definitions was to determine if they provided

exemption for student licensure. I'm not quite sure how to handle this because we can discuss it further with regard to student licensure....

Ms. Groose – The question we were asking in our minds was would a student be considered an interpreter and are students considered to be interpreting, and if the answer is that they are considered to be interpreting, then anyone practicing as an interpreter must be licensed, which would say then that students, in order to practice, must be licensed. If all those things I just said you agree with.

Dr. Guillory – Right, if all those things we said are true – however that doesn't mean that we have to agree. Sandy, do you want to open any further discussion on this? Maybe we should start with you.

Ms. Drummond – At the last meeting we thought perhaps that the way the law written, there was already an exemption that existed, and that's what we were trying to clarify, whether that exemption was already there. It seems like the exemption is not already there, so we're back to square one and still have the same problem. The way the law is currently written, it's illegal to interpret anywhere without a license. We all agreed that is not acceptable, students need to gain field experience, they need to be out there interpreting so we still have to get to the "how" should they do that. We talked before about student licenses, we talked about exemptions, we talked about exemption with supervision requirements. We have a lot of alternatives but we're back to the point where we have to choose an alternative. We still have the problem that we haven't resolved.

Dr. Guillory – So the bottom line is we've discussed this a lot, there's been much, much discussion about it but we still have to make some type of decision with regard to the alternatives that have been brought up. Why don't we start with the first alternative, which is to find a way to exempt students. Is that a viable alternative?

Mr. Adams – On the first page of the papers that I've come up with, based on my research of other states of RID of other statutes, I've combined a lot of words and ideas together to create an exemption for students, but it's fairly strict, there are a lot of conditions that must be met. They must be enrolled in an ITP that leads to a degree, as opposed to enrolled in an ITP or an ASL1 class. It has to be an accredited institution of higher education, and not at the YMCA. And also that they are engaged only in the activities and services that are part of their supervised course of study, and that they also have to clearly identify themselves as a student interpreter, practicum student or whatever that the different colleges use. It's for consideration, it's one alternative that from what the discussion has been over the past year about this topic, that I tried to get a little bit of something for everyone in there and not forget one group or support one group more than the other, I tried to make it a compromise for everyone, for your consideration.

Dr. Guillory – I'd like to ask Sandy say something, Sandy in the past you've talked about the fact that you did some research and looked at some other licensed professions and how they handle students either being exempt or licensed, or whatever. Do you want to talk a little bit about some of the other professions?

Ms. Drummond – I think that one of the things that we still need to keep in the forefront of our minds that the real issue is whether or not it is necessary to have supervision of students, to have any control over students at all, whether or not that is necessary, that is the basic issue, and that's really what should be decided before we decide anything else. But in the past there has been some concern that perhaps we're the first person who ever thought of supervising students or something like that. So I kind of looked up the other licensed professions in Missouri and looked at what their supervision requirements are. Many of the other professions also require...that some require student licenses, some exempt the students as long as they are supervised by someone who does have a license, others are not allowed to practice that profession, period. What that means is, for instance, a CPA – there is no student license and no exemption – the person who is doing the work of a CPA cannot claim to be a CPA, cannot actually produce that product, unless someone who is a CPA looks at it and approves it and they're considered the ones who made that product. So there are a lot of different models out there and there are also some other models that allow people who are not in these accredited programs that perhaps have their own life experience that want to get a student license or to be exempted, while they are practicing as long as they have supervision, there are a lot of different models that we can look at just within the licensed professions in our own state. So we can certainly look at that, but I don't think we need to spend time

looking at that right now until we decide whether or not it's necessary to have supervision at any level. If it's not necessary then we don't need to worry about that.

Ms. McEnulty – But aren't we talking about student licenses right now?

Ms. Drummond – I think that in past meetings we've pretty much decided that we don't want to go the route of student licenses. We don't want to have to have people fill out an application, pay a license fee, and send them licenses, things like that. Although certainly that is one of the alternatives, to have a student license, and there are professions that do that. We could exempt completely. We could exempt with certain conditions, such as the definition that John suggested, we could have whatever conditions we wanted to add on to it. Those are the three options that we've been discussing.

Stephanie Logan – I'd just like to take the opportunity now if I can to talk about my feelings related to supervision of students that interpret, if that's possible. I know that you've already had a lot of discussion about that but as a deaf consumer of interpreters, I'd like the opportunity to discuss how I feel about that. For some of you that already know, I'm also a commissioner on the MO Commission for the Deaf and I am also the Executive Director for the LEAD Institute, which provides statewide services for deaf individuals. I'm here today in the capacity of a deaf consumer who utilizes interpreters. I just finished my MBA and I had interpreters that went through the entire 2 years with me, interpreting for me. I'm currently working on my PhD in counseling psychology and I have interpreters for every single one of my classes, for my counseling that I do with clients I utilize interpreters. I utilize interpreters when I go to parties and when I go to funerals and when I go to weddings, and when I go to parent-teacher conferences with my children. I have 4 children so I utilize interpreters a lot. I have also used student interpreters and have been in situations where I've had to have student interpreters, more so particularly when I first lost my hearing which was 11 years ago to spinal meningitis. I was living in the state of Georgia and was in a situation where I was finishing my last year of college and at different times when my staff interpreters, couldn't come to class or she was sick, they would send a student interpreter from a local ITP program. Because obviously I was a late deaf adult, as it was I didn't really understand the interpreter that I had, so they figured a student interpreter wasn't going to hurt me because I couldn't understand the language in the first place and I was just trying to get by. My issue related to student interpreters not being supervised is it's incredibly irresponsible for the State Committee for Interpreters to allow student interpreters to be out there. I don't care if there isn't a deaf person in the audience – that's been an argument before of, a lot of times student interpreters are interpreting in situations where there's no one that's deaf in the audience. The problem is how does a student interpreter know that what they're doing is potentially wrong if they do an incorrect sign or for whatever reason that they're just not interpreting it correctly, they're just continuing. It would be like me being allowed to, as I learn to become a counselor, for me to be allowed to provide counseling to clients without any kind of supervision. It's irresponsible for the profession to allow me to do that. I also look at it as though it would be like me to go to a doctor and I find out I have a tumor, and they say you're going to have to have brain surgery to have the tumor removed. So they say, okay we're going to have you go in for surgery and there's going to be a student surgeon doing the surgery – my brain surgery – and that student does it without supervision. Obviously none of us would want to have brain surgery with a student performing the surgery. I don't even know that I would want them to with supervision. A lot of you think 'well this isn't brain surgery' but for me it is, because that is how I communicate with people, that's how I get information. I don't care if I am at a stamping party and I'm just talking with friends, that information is just as vital to me as is my Advanced History of Psychology class over at the University of Missouri. This is a topic that is very, very important to me. I understand from some of the things and letters that I've been reading in the packet some animosity towards Sandy Drummond about the whole student interpreter situation. My concern about that is if someone like Sandy Drummond wasn't on the commission informing people about what's going on, I'm a mother with four children, I run an agency that provides services for deaf people. I'll be honest with you I have no idea...I don't keep up with what's going on in the state of Missouri regarding interpreters. I know when I go and I have a situation where I need an interpreter, my main situation...the thing that I'm feeling is, I've got to have somebody that I know I can trust. I'm a well educated person that lost her hearing when she was 23 years old so I don't need anybody advocating for me, I can advocate for myself. But I have worked for more than 8 years with deaf individuals that cannot advocate for themselves, they don't have that opportunity, and if it wasn't for someone like Carrie McCray or Sandy Drummond I wouldn't know what's going on. I know that's a bad thing to say as a commission member with the Missouri Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing. So I am here as a deaf individual saying

please, please, really consider before you just kind of brush something under the rug and go and say 'well, we'll just let them slide or we don't need to cover this one'. For me and for those individuals that I represent today, I would just ask that you really consider that all students be required to have supervision.

Lisa Betzler – I have a question to ask Stephanie. If a student went in to interpret for you, if you had a brain tumor, and you found out you had the brain tumor, correct? We're talking about that situation? Who sent this student? Who was it that sent the student for you, to interpret? That's the hospital's responsibility – that's their fault – they know better than that. They know that they shouldn't use students. That's their liability. Anyway if you had a problem with an IT program or the school or whatever, there was a complaint...you have to inform....The hospital would be the one to make the decision about sending a student or not, same thing as an ITP program they're responsible for sending in a student or not for what situations they go into or not.

Dan Betzler – I think we need to first of all define what supervision is. I think that that's not clear in regards to if we write it in to any kind of legislation or rule, then it is up to the college or institution to interpret what that means...what does supervision mean? I think there is misconception in regards to students being sent out without supervision. I don't think the state committee has ever addressed the fact that any college or ITP program sends out students without some kind of supervision. What my understanding of the state committee is that they want to mandate to higher education what the term supervision means and in doing so understanding the state's budget cuts. There has to be some fiscal part of the statute...if we're going to say that...the cost has to be absorbed somewhere, the institution, the student, or the state will have to pay for, if we define supervision as a certified licensed interpreter at a level 3, 4, or 5, must be with every student any time they facilitate communications between a deaf person and a hearing person, then the money for that person has to come from somewhere. If it's constituted from the college, that the college has to absorb that cost or the student has to absorb that cost, or the state is willing to absorb that cost. It's not an issue of whether or not mentor is appropriate. Of course we all think mentoring is appropriate. What we need from you is a decision as to whether or not, who will absorb the cost of this mentoring, where will it go, and the college will then proceed from there. No one is disputing the fact that the ideal situation would be for every interpreter training program student to go to a Tupperware party, to go to a stamp party, to go to a scrap book party with a certified licensed interpreter at a level 3, 4 or 5. Believe me if we were in an ideal world that's exactly what I would like to see. What I also would like to ask is that when considering these things, that we please consider those that will benefit financially. As I have been working in this as a practical instructor for many years, I have tried to put together mentor programs on a volunteer basis with the three agencies in the St Louis Metropolitan area. They never panned out. Interpreters would not volunteer their time or things would fall apart when we put together rules, we put together for the mentee, the mentor, and so forth. It doesn't happen on a volunteer basis. Now that the state committee is getting involved I've received several phone calls from each agency telling me that certainly they'd like to be involved, and how are we going to pay them. So when you see these letters from different people, I think that we need to realize, of course just like myself - identifying myself from St Louis Community College, as an instructor that we need to know which ones, which of these people, are representing themselves or the agency in which they free lance and work for. Because that exactly who is going to benefit from mandated mentorship by the State Committee of Interpreters. They are going to be the ones that the colleges or universities call to say we need some mentors, this is what we'll pay them, and that cost is going to have to be absorbed somewhere.

Dr. Guillory – I think...and the other committee members can correct me if I'm not wording this correctly, the problem as I see it with visitors, interpreters who are not on the committee, deaf consumers, do not understand the bind that we are in with regard to the language that is in the law. And the language is what has been giving us the problem, it's not something that we've wanted. Believe me, if we could find a way to avoid this issue or handle it easily, we would. The problem is the language and the way the law was written, which is something that we can not change immediately, and the way it's written and interpreted, is that students are interpreting, and that's the problem that we have, is that they are interpreting by definition of the law, and that is why we are having problems with finding a way to enforce a code of ethics for the students. Now have I stated that correctly?

Ms. Drummond -- That's the reason why we're having all these discussions, yes, we have to change the law. I would say that we still need to decide whether or not supervision, direct supervision is what I have

been thinking of it and Dan's right...that all students in ITP programs in the state of Missouri now do have certain levels of supervision. They have a faculty member that is responsible for screening the assignments that they go to. They do have supervision. What we've been talking about is supervision in our discussion has been direct supervision of the students while they are engaged in the act of interpreting. So that's a point of debate. There are several points of debate and there are different avenues we can take. The concern is over how much supervision should there be, if there should be supervision, how does it get paid for, how's that going to work, is it feasible, is the need for it great enough that it outweighs the risk or the amount of money that has to be paid, those are the things that we haven't really fully discussed.

Dr. Guillory -- Okay, so your feeling is that the first part of the discussion should focus on whether or not students need face-to-face, one-on-one supervision?

Ms. Drummond -- Yes

Dr. Guillory -- Okay and from there we will go on.

Ms. Drummond -- I think that's the most straightforward way to deal with that.

Dr. Guillory -- This is why I wanted you to mention what you had found when you researched other professions, and I wish that you would just take it a little bit further. What other professions do in terms of when students are actually in the act of practicing the profession for which they are training, do they have supervision, one-on-one, with a licensed individual in that profession?

Ms. Drummond -- I can go through the stack and give you the statutes and the rules for each profession. I don't know exactly how those things are interpreted by that profession and I don't have copies for all professions, but those professions have already answered the question that we are now faced with, which is -- is it necessary to have supervision and they've decided how to go about that. We haven't even decided if it's necessary or not yet. So I think that we could do this but I think our time is better spent deciding whether or not we need to have supervision. Then we can look at models for how to do that.

Ms. McNulty -- This discussion gets kind of convoluted sometimes, I believe that supervision is being provided. I think what's kind of leading us astray is how we perceive supervision, so one-on-one, one-to-two, one-to-three, one-to-four, meeting in a class room for 3 hours a week, that's what we need to define. I think there are some differences in how we define supervision, because also with other professions and I can talk about myself and my career profession is that I'm under supervision, direct supervision, but I don't receive that direct supervision while I am in the act of working. But I do get that supervision. Does that make sense? Kind of like if you take it to the classroom, so the student might be interpreting just something, something that's been set up for them, everybody's understood, accepted, and approved, and they go to do that and that student still has class 3 hours a week that pertains to practicum and supervision, so is that what we mean by supervision, or do we still mean that class okay is part of the program or do we need an interpreter out there in the field, so we haven't defined what we mean by supervision. I think that's why it gets so convoluted here.

Ms. Drummond -- Right, So we need to decide what level of supervision is necessary and....

Ms. McNulty -- Why does it have to be a level? Is a deaf instructor at a program not...I mean, how are they qualified to be...

Ms. Drummond - What type of supervision? Well that's what you're saying, how do we define supervision, what is supervision? And there are different ways to define it and that's what we're looking for, what is the definition of supervision that everybody agrees is necessary.

Dr. Guillory -- Okay, Roy did you have something you wanted to say?

Dr Miller -- We've all been so involved in this discussion for so long that sometimes we don't know where to start. Let me remind you of a statistic that I gave you before. The Division of Professional Registration, licenses forty-two (42) different professions. We did a check and of those forty-two (42) only three (3)

required student licenses. I was interested in what it was that was common to those three that was in a sense different from any of the others. Sandy, you suggested that the first question is that we have to address is do we need supervision. I would suggest that the first question really is something a little different, the first question is in this profession, can we realistically require supervision or provide supervision. Let me go back to those three professions that require student licenses. Cosmetology, Barbering, and I honestly forgot the third one. Let's look at these two – in order to become a barber you go to barber school, and you have to do so many hours of practice cutting under supervision, right? Why do they do that? Because they have a school there, a place where the person wants to learn to be a barber goes there and their supervision is there. They can have one licensed barber supervise 5 or 6 chairs, walk around, it's possible. The same is true for cosmetologists, you want to become a cosmetologist you don't serve your internship by going out and doing people's hair in their homes, you go to a school of cosmetology, which is a central facility where supervision is practical, where it can be done. Our interpreters they serve their internship, do they go only to the school, no. Is it realistically possible for us to have a licensed interpreter following them into each and everyone one of these places to "supervise". I think that's an important thing that you need to think about, is whether or not it's realistically possible in that professional training, for supervision to be had every minute of the day that the student's learning. Now, let me go to supervision in a different slant – I think Stephanie has appropriately pointed out that all of our professions – counselors, psychiatrist, psychologist, doctors, dentists, they all serve some kind of an internship of practice before they're allowed to go out and work in the real world. Doctors become interns, they're not licensed as interns, they're not one of our 3 licensed professions, they serve an internship. Let me ask you do you honestly think that there is a licensed physician standing, looking over the shoulder of the intern 18 hours a day, which is the average that interns and medical professionals often serve in hospitals. The answer is clearly no. They have supervision some of the time and some of the time they don't have supervision. They have different learning experiences that are involved in internship. What about student interpreters? Do they have supervision? Yeah, the hundreds of hours they spend in the classroom, that's under direct supervision, and they get feedback about what they're doing right, what they're doing wrong, their on one to one. But they also have to have other learning experiences where somebody isn't looking over their shoulder just like the intern physician has to learn to put a band-aid on and take it off by himself without that patient punching him in the nose. And he doesn't have a licensed physician there every time he's putting a band-aid on or is taking it off. It's not an all or nothing situation for interpreters just like interns in any of our professions. I sometimes feel like you're trying to treat it an all or nothing and I really don't understand why. I'm going to close by making a suggestion. I fully understand that we're talking about statutory language and the reason this is on our plate is because of the way the statutes are drafted. I asked last year what if you wanted me to change the statute and you said no. Next thing we did was get the Division's dead lines to the legislative process and you're already too late to get anything through your Division's deadlines for this year. I'm prepared right this minute to go into the legislature and fix this problem by statutory change. Get it off of our plate to exempt students who are in interpreter training programs, from all the language requirements of our statutes. I want to know before I do that is there anyone on this committee who basically will support me in that effort and go and testify when it comes time for the committee hearings on this proposed bill. Or all we all sitting here really just playing. We've got statutory language and now we've got an opportunity to fix it. I told you last time we had an opportunity to fix it right by changing the statute and I'm ready to do that. Are you against changing that statute, are you using that as a defense, as a reason for continuing this discussion when we really don't need to? What we need to do is go together, support this, go in to the legislature and get it fixed now.

Dr. Guillory – Let me say one thing. I know these discussions have drawn out rather long and I know that sometimes we feel that there should be some limit. I want to give everybody a chance to talk who really wants to say something but I'm going to ask people to please keep their comments brief, so that we can move on, sometimes we come full circle and I really feel that it is fair to hear everybody, but please try to keep your comments brief.

Stephanie Logan – I just want to clarify what I meant and I did mean on direct supervision when I was talking about supervision for interpreters. I did mean that. Also when I was talking about my self as a student working towards a counseling psychology degree I am required to have direct supervision. In my last supervision experience they were behind a glass, and now for all three practicums I have to be video taped with my client during the time that I'm with and also audio taped. So I know for my experience as a student in a program, I am supervised directly all the time that I am working with a client. I would expect

nothing different for a language requirement for communication. I think that what Roy is talking about...what makes me nervous about that is that there would be no requirement at all. So that language change, my concern about that is there would be no requirement for students at all, it would be a decision that ITP program and I have a lot of concerns about.

Janice Cobb – I just want some kind of supervision there. Like you said videotaping - that was a good way. Setting up some kind of rules for in the future for ITP programs or whatever. You should make the rules successful. Put it in there so that it can be successful and we'll go through it.

Dan Betzler – A couple of things. I don't know...I wish somebody would define for me what they think an ITP program is supposed to do. I thought our job was to educate and supervise the students as they work in the field. I'm curious to know what kind of experiences you've had with an interpreting student that was inappropriate and if so, I wish you would share that. My job as a practicum instructor is to definitely make sure everyone involved knows that a student is working in that setting and also working in translation, coming back to the classroom, calling me on the telephone night & day from different spaces. Working together in the past, that students have direct contact with me day and night through the summertime. I just thought it was our job as instructors to instruct. My understanding is now that the state wants to mandate how we instruct and as I said before I cannot give a grade to a student who I do not know what they're doing. I will not have someone mentor a student for \$50.00, sign off on them, and me give them a grade. I think then the state needs to issue the grade because as a college professor I will not sign off on a professional who I do not know or maybe has a higher level of certification linguistically but I'm not sure ethically how their behavior is. I think we have to identify the issues and I am trying to be brief, but in regard to interpreting, that it is not just linguistics and most of the interpreting assignments that we send our students on are not that linguistically challenging. It's primarily things like longevity, how long can they interpret, what kinds of issues come up, they can't supervise young children in a camp setting, those kinds of things. So those are just other issues beyond the hopefully with the (I think) more than qualified deaf instructors, my wife being one and two other deaf instructors, on our faculty that our responsibility is the linguistic challenges that they are faced with in the classroom prior to going out there. We would not send them out if we felt they were not qualified. We also give them, the deaf community, feedback forms ad so forth. If somebody thinks I'm going to stand up in front of a group of people as one of my students is interpreting, and inappropriately correct their signs or voice interpret, yell out something, as some of my colleagues have done to other people, I don't think it's appropriate, so I think I'm trying to teach some of the things that I thought were inappropriate in the profession early on. So I don't know that that I can have anybody sign off and so I said to my administration I will not grade people that I can not supervise. I will not sign off on a grade that I do not know the work was done, and that it was done appropriately, and the education was there in the way that I think under the RID Code of Ethics is expected. So we have to come up with some kind of ruling in regard to that as well. If we are going to mandate direct supervision, then we need to say what kind of responsibility does that person have to the college and university, in regards to their responsibility saying that this person did get the proper education, because I will not be responsible for that as a professor.

Ms. Drummond – Can I respond also. Again, we still haven't decided whether or not any of these settings actually require supervision or what kind of supervision, whether it should be in class or should it be direct or should it be video taped, or should we have all the consumers sign a waiver saying 'we don't care, this is a student, that's okay with us, we don't need any supervision', there's lots of alternatives. We haven't decided any of those. But there's just some things I wanted to respond to. First of all, as far as the concerns of having someone else teach your students I completely understand that. I would never expect that to happen. I wouldn't want to encourage that at all. I would expect that if the college has to have their students supervised or arrange to have them supervised, but the college would actually select the people that were going to be doing that supervision, the college would train them, the college would provide them with a syllabus, the college would provide them with all these materials and that may be part of it also. Yes, I agree. That is certainly a consideration that we have to think of. The faculty would also be responsible for direct evaluation of the student's performance. Similar to student teaching experiences where you have someone out in the field for eight to ten weeks, they have a supervisor on site, because the faculty person can't be every place that the student is, can't actually get a sample of their work on site...

Dan Betzler - ...that's exactly what Roy was saying. If we had a building where we said every deaf person that needs practicum students to interpreter for them come to this building. Then we could do that, as we can do it in education... What is going to happen is that we are going to water down the practicum system. I can tell you that the solution is that we just have less hours of practicum.

Dr. Guillory – Usually I can be pretty good at summarizing what's going on, I keep trying to summarize what's going on and trying to draw us back and I think the bottom line is we can not agree. I think there needs to be a clear distinction between the committee and between visitors. On the other hand I think what visitors have to say is very important, and what the interpreters and the deaf community have to say is very important, but the bottom line is we are never going to agree on whether or not supervision is needed for students, or agree on what kind of supervision is needed, and I think we need to know that. We are not going to agree. We have people in the deaf community – I've talked to people in the deaf community – who have, they're 180 on this issue, some of them want it every minute and some don't care. We as a committee can not make everybody happy and I think it's important that we realize that, we can not make everybody happy. I think that the visitors need to know that too. I'm not sure how to address that problem but I think that everybody needs to realize as we sit here and talk about it, we can not come to an agreement on even the most basic thing. So what are we going to do about that? I want to hear from some of the committee members about this. What can we do? I'm asking for suggestions about this basic problem.

Ms. Drummond - I think that many of the points that we've heard today and many of the points that we've heard before, so I think everybody has had access to that information. I know there were new e-mails that were sent before this last meeting. Is there any info in those e-mails that we've haven't already discussed in previous meetings? I know one there was a suggestion I believe it was from Kelley Clark, her idea was to have an exception provided that requires supervision in all settings, except have a waiver that students can bring with them that all the consumers at the assignment sign saying 'we understand this is a student and they are not being supervised while they are engaged in the act of interpreting right now.' That's one thing we had not yet discussed. Are there any other alternatives that we haven't yet discussed?

Mr. Adams – Well, the one that I presented. Well, the exemption but exemption as part of the supervised course of study, it has restrictions within it and it specifies, it makes it very clear what is required of the students if they're going to be exempted.

Ms. Drummond – What do you mean by supervised course of study.

Mr. Adams – I'm implying that it is supervised, that the students are not out there on their own, the students aren't calling up saying 'hi I'm a student, do you want to use an interpreter?' Somebody else is getting the assignments for them, approved through their institute of higher education, through their course of study.

Ms. Drummond -- I asked that because there are other professions where the licensing committee dictates the curriculum, so that's why I was asking if that's what you meant, that's not what you meant. What you mean is they're in a program where there is regular faculty, there are supervisors there in the program.

Mr. Adams -- Also as a part of the supervised course of study allows them to interpret for each other in the classroom. I know that we've discussed that rule as well but here's another thing that this exempts them from interpreting within the classroom for each other, because that is also part of the supervised course of study. But that is a different topic, so....

Ms. McNulty - I don't believe it is, in trying to wrap everything up and listen to everyone, I think that there is not going to be a solution, however I don't know if there was any kind of an issue, besides the language in the rule and the statutes, that say somehow we have to license the students. Every time we talk about student licenses it takes us to supervision, and that in turn takes us to the programs and on down the line. I think if we'd just re-focus our energies back into whether or not we should license the students or exempt them, and then the programs can go on, they can require their students to get the license or not, and then they can go on with their supervision. I don't see that there is really anything that has really happened, yet, I know we need to be preventing that, but so far everything has been good, people have

turned out good interpreters. So I think the main focus is the license of the students. And then the programs can re-direct their students in the license, how it works, the code of ethics and profession and all that kind of stuff that comes with that training and direct supervision whether they're out in the field or in the classroom, or one-on-one. So really the bottom line is just licensing the student. So, do we want to exempt them from licensure or do we want to require that they have to obtain the license.

Ms. Drummond – I don't see the issue is that simple. I thought we had already decided, and we've certainly can discuss it again, that we don't want to provide student licenses...

Ms. McEnulty -- Okay, so we're going to exempt students. Okay

Ms. Drummond -- What we've been debating is the conditions for the exemptions, and so I'll just put out on the table, I would not vote for any exemptions for licensures for students working in situations that require a level 5 certification. Never. I would never vote for that.

Ms. McEnulty -- I don't know that that's happening, see that's where we start going, we start straying off...

Ms. Drummond -- ...It doesn't matter if that's what's happening or not, I still would never vote for that.

Ms. McEnulty – But I think also that the colleges are not doing that and they're covering all their bases and so I feel like that part has always been fulfilled.

Ms. Drummond – So what you're saying is your motion would be to exempt students from direct supervision, and exempt students as long as they're in an ITP program, whatever your conditions are, and to not require supervision of a licensed interpreter while they are engaged in the act of interpreting, regardless of what situation they're in?

Ms. McEnulty – But I think that's two different issues. I think that requiring a licensed (am I not seeing this the same as you guys) requiring a licensed interpreter to watch me work, I can go to you Sandy and ask for you to mentor me, okay, so I do that, but that has nothing to do with my license. Right? Have I just gone totally off? Okay, if we give a student a license what are we saying?

Mr. Adams – They're the same as a professional, in my opinion.

Ms. McEnulty – Right, so then supervision doesn't matter, right? They're responsible for what they do, what assignments they accept, so on and so forth. So, then if we go down the path of the exemption, I recall several months back we were talking about exempting interpreters who are RID, NAD, 5/5 from out of state, to come and interpret conventions, professional meetings, and they were exempt, so a student can't fall under that? And so if they do fall under that exemption, where is the supervision, see I'm getting – I think I'm confused still, how those two come into play.

Ms. Drummond - The student interpreter issue has nothing to do with the visiting interpreter issue, because the visiting interpreters that we exempted have already demonstrated their competence on a national certification exam, and it's a completely different issue.

Ms. McEnulty – right, but the students are not out there working on level 5 saying that I'm trained and skilled and all that. So that's where when you talk about a student being in a program, it is should they be exempt or not. So we think they should be exempt from licensure, so when they do work they're not out there on their own anyway, they already have the program backing them up and supporting them and creating the environment for them while they are working, so they are in effect getting supervision, that's why I don't see how those two get interchanged. They're students.

Becky Beck – Can I just ask a question? What if you're not in an ITP program and you still want to be a student learner? I've been in an ITP program. I am not currently in one. I know other people who might not go through an ITP programs, but they still need that practice, they're still a student too just in a different format.

Dr. Guillory – Well we've had some concerns about that in the past, that topic has come up, that if you exempt students in ITP programs, what do you do about other people out there who are calling themselves students, they're not licensed and they don't fall under a code of ethics.

Ms. McEnulty – They're not students, they're not...

Dr. Guillory – They're not technically students, that's true, so they would be interpreting without a license.

Becky Beck – So how could they be students under a responsible interpreter, you know, like a licensed interpreter.

Ms. McEnulty – Go through a program.

Becky Beck -- What if they've already gone through the program though.

Ms. McEnulty -- And they want to go back for more training?

Becky Beck -- No, not necessarily. I'm just saying that I think the definition of "student" in just an ITP program is too restrictive.

Ms. Goose – How do people practice from the time that they complete the ITP program, to the point that they become licensed? What are they doing, how are they practicing, are they practicing?

Dan Betzler – In the program they actually go for their certification test in the middle of their practicum, so by the time they complete their practicum, they should be already licensed. So in the center of their practicum they are to go take the test, there's just that time lapse in regards to getting the results back, and then as soon as they get the results back, they should get licensed.

Dr. Guillory -- Okay, I have a question for you. I know of professions where students have to do the same thing but they don't pass. They don't pass their certification test. How does the student get the practice they need if that happens, has that ever happened?

Dan Betzler – Thank God, it's never happened in the program where I teach, that they haven't at least gotten a novice level of certification, but the results are not obtained usually at this point, until they actually come to complete their course work. Now our curriculum has been totally revised so we have actually 2 full semesters of practicum in the new curriculum, so hopefully by the 2nd semester of practicum where we can do more observation in the first that possibly if something was mandated we would probably have them go test, we would have them test prior to the 2nd practicum which would then give them a license to practice at a level 1/2 assignment without any supervision, because if they passed it at that point, we really can't screen what they're doing, but we would be forced to in order to give them that experience, so what would happen is we would do observation in class work in the 1st practicum and then the 2nd practicum field work they would have to test, obtain their license, and do that other practicum.

Ms. McEnulty – And that's what students I think are more and more doing now, see that takes me back to if the student is in a program and licensed & certified and they are under the guidance of the school program, and they go out and there's a complaint against them and they're under direct supervision, then what do you discipline? The student, 'cause they don't have a license; the interpreter, they are certified and licensed, however they're under the guidance of the program.

Dan Betzler – I think I might be able to answer that. At the present time or prior to the licensing it was the coordinator of the program whose license was at risk, who signed off on both the certification and .. because it's the instructor and not the program coordinator, if any behavior is questionable I would always make sure that the coordinator was aware of the behavior, to make sure that if any repercussions she was well aware of.

Ms. McEnulty – Even if they were licensed and certified?

Dan Betzler – Oh, not if they were licensed and certified, that would go directly to the students.

Ms. McEnulty – Okay, even if they were under a programs guidance but they were still students, a lot of students are going and testing and there are getting their novice level and then they're going ahead and receiving their license, so they're like certified interpreters however they are under the guidance of the ITP program and you're the one that is creating that practicum.

Dan Betzler – We may choose to fail them but ...

Ms. McEnulty -- Even if they're under the program? Really? Even if training sent them out? Really? Okay.

Ms. Goose – Has your program thought and investigated into contracting with interpreting agency, interpreting services, that you would send your students to and then a student would go with the licensed interpreter on every assignment, that's basically a lot of what the nursing students do? The school of nursing would contract with the different facilities so...

Dan Betzler– I can tell you that early on we did have relationships with each one of the interpreting agencies in the City of St Louis with the exception of Deaf Way, which is a newer agency. We just voluntarily asked them to start a mentor program, we thought it would be beneficial for the students. This is my perception. I compare it to the evaluators that we have with the BCI. Initially there were all kinds of interpreters saying I will come there and help your students and so we have a room full of 20 interpreters in there by the end of the semester there were maybe 2 that benefited from that program. Same as the evaluating issue that we had in the state of Missouri in regard to the first two (2) years, there were evaluators every Saturday and all of a sudden there was a volunteer process so there were no evaluators left. That's my theory in regards to that. In regards to contracting, I can tell you now with the state cuts in post secondary education it will be very difficult for us to fund anything outside of the one instructor that teaches practicum. At this time 3600 hours for a class of 30. With the CEU issue you would need 10 interpreters per student getting their 1.2 CEUs.

Ms. Goose – I'm not talking about any money. I'm talking about your students being involved with a licensed interpreter who works for an agency, the agency gets the call for the job, the licensed interpreter goes to that job and the student goes with the licensed interpreter, so that's just...

Dan Betzler –The agencies have addressed some issues. They have to do the paperwork to get approval from the deaf person and approval from the agency, that they also...we want to make sure that the student isn't put in an inappropriate situation so most of those situations would be 3, 4 and 5 maybe, Which would be great experience but that they not be asked to team and they not be billed for the student's involvement. So those are issues that we have in regards to those instances. We did try to set some of those things up in the past, so many issues involved but we would have to have some ability to say what was appropriate for our students, where we would take responsibility. The agencies at this point have contacted us in regard to developing a relationship but never without cost involved.

Ms. Goose – You're thinking about your options and what your options are. One of your options is to do nothing, carry on just the way that you have been, realizing that students are not addressed in your statute, you've known that for years. That's an option in my opinion.

Ms. McEnulty – I guess for the committee though isn't it that they are in the act of interpreting?

Ms. Goose – They have always been in the act of interpreting.

Mr. Adams –And we can't change that definition too exclude students.

Janice Cobb – Note: offered some comments but interpreter was not speaking loud enough to obtain enough of Ms. Cobb's statement.

Kathleen Alexander – I'm kind of lost in all of this so I will try to keep my thoughts really brief. Seems like we just have to do a lot of trusting here although that's one of the reasons why the law was brought up, because we didn't trust anybody. So, it is kind of we're fighting each other. I know that Florissant Community College, and not to say anything pro or against it, it has a great reputation and Dan is a

wonderful instructor. But we can't have Dans everywhere, we can't have this stuff going on, it's a total trust. So, just speaking of what...I want to add just two things: there are people out there who want to interpret who aren't in an ITP. For instance you have Becky back here, you have Alex Miller here and Janice. All for different reasons they're not in but want to be interpreters. Where do they get their practice time, the law is not to exempt anyone from becoming an interpreter, we don't want that. So where do they get theirs? If we're going to exempt students, which is a good idea to exempt students from license, is why can't a professional interpreter, like myself, say "I will take the responsibility of Alex, Janice and Becky, with my license on the line. I'll sign the paper and say I take full responsibility, I want to be with them and I can do it today, to be with them and mentor them and on site, direct supervision with them. I think that's important for interpreters who are in the field to stand up in this because their our future interpreters and we have to take the time. I have taken the time immensely and mentored a lot of people that have gone and taken the test. I just think that is our duty. I wish more of us felt that way. But I know I'm one of the people that are in a rare pool that I'm willing you know...Dan Betzler can call me today and says I have an interpreter, will you mentor them 24/7 and be there with them, I would say, "sure enough, I would do that" so it's just...whatever... I felt like I rambled there.

Ms. Drummond – I believe that we should put that as an item of discussion on our next meeting agenda, and just to let you know that I did see a model for how to get that done to provide like a student permit or a provisional permit or something to someone who could demonstrate if they had so many years of experience doing this, or these certain skills or they've done this kind of program or there was a set of conditions and they could get a provisional permit to someone who could demonstrate that they had so many years experience doing this or that they have certain skills, or they've done this kind of program or there was this other condition that they could get a provisional permit that would last 6 months, that kind of thing. So there are models that we can look at that would accomplish that purpose, and I think in the past, to be honest, I've been a little resistant to the idea, because I've seen the national organizations moving toward requiring bachelors degrees or associates degree before you can sit for the written test. And I think, oh yeah, you know what here in Missouri we only have 300 people. We really need all the people we can get, so we don't need to be closing doors and so maybe we should be opening some doors, so I would certainly like to see this on the agenda of the next meeting, I don't think we have time to resolve that issue here. I do think it is a distinct issue from the student interpreter issue and I hope we can resolve that at the next meeting...

Dr. Guillory -- We only have so much time, we have the rest of the agenda to get to, so are you all comfortable just....Oh, I'm sorry Lisa, go ahead.

Lisa Betzler – I want to remind you that we do have higher education and we can't tell the colleges what to do. I just want you to keep that in mind.

Ms. Drummond – I need to clarify also. Many of our colleges and universities, all of them that are accredited have an accreditation through some commission or board or council, that accredits general academic programs or liberal arts programs. There are also other commissions and councils that provide accreditation specifically for training in the particular profession. While I was doing my research on the different professions in Missouri and I would be glad to share that with you, almost all of them will exempt students who are enrolled in a program that is accredited specifically by their professional organization. It does not mention the Council on Higher Education or the state committee on higher education or North Central Accreditation Association. It requires the National Nursing Board or something like that. In our profession, Interpreting, that would be comparable to the accreditation council which was established by the Conference of Interpreter Trainers which very recently was passed the last business meeting in October, and so that's in effect in 1-2 years that's would be an analogy. Many of these other professions not only dictate where you get your accreditation, they dictate the curriculum, they say you have to have 3 hours of this or 6 hours of that, you have to have 150 hours supervised internship. So it is something that has been going on in other professions, this is not a new idea. Not to say that that's what we're going to do, but that does happen some times, so I just wanted to make that point.

Dan Betzler – I just wanted to assure you that prior to before when there was no accreditation in regard to specifically interpreter training programs, that we had ? come and analyze our program to make sure that all IP standards, and spent hours and hours and hundreds of dollars, again I would love to have the new

accreditation that's come out with the cuts in state funding, I don't know how soon that will happen but we did do that.

Ms. Drummond – Based on the 6 months we've been dealing with this, I feel you have the impression that this is all about Florissant Valley Community College, and as Kathleen says, it's not. It's about setting a standard for the state of Missouri, it has...yes, you are very respected instructor and it is not about you Dan Betzler, we wish there were many Dan Betzler's in the state of Missouri. It is about setting a standard that everyone is to follow when you retire. What's going to happen? Don't take it personal.

Dan Betzler - ...size of the program, that many of the things when we sat here with Caroline and she said she had one graduate last year, I could do that I could follow them around and do 120 hours with no problem. It's the size that seems to be putting out the most graduates. Not all of them are working the profession, but we're looking at 3600 hours vs. 120 hours or whatever they require. But that was why I think we felt a little bit attacked is that would definitely change the whole structure of our program where it would not really change Maplewood, would not really change William Woods, but it would definitely have to change the entire structure of Florissant Valley and their program as it exists.

Dr. Guillory -- Are we comfortable at this moment on doing nothing after all? Are we comfortable doing nothing, you've already wanted to put on the agenda...of course, that's a completely different topic. Let me ask the committee this: do you want to discuss this again during the next meeting? Do you want to continue the discussion? I mean we have to move on.

Ms. Drummond – What do we need to discuss?

Dr. Guillory – I think we need to discuss whether or not we want to do nothing.

Ms. Drummond – Do you want for us to take a vote on that right now or do we need to discuss it?

Mr. Adams – I make a motion that we do nothing about student licensure, we don't worry about them, we end this discussion here and now.

Dr. Guillory – I'll second it, I'll be brave and second it. I think it may come up...I'm not saying it won't come up again at some point, but I think that where we are right now, we can not seem to move forward and we have other issues to address. It's going to come up again, you know it is. But I just think for right now, I think everybody involved in this issue could use a breather.

Ms. Drummond – I've been trying to investigate the whole thing, my personal opinions I've shared, I have been willing to compromise in some of my opinions about those things, but I think that refraining from taking a stand on something is not resolution. I think we should take a stand on something, but again I tend to be a rules oriented person and the way the law stands right now it doesn't work, it's wrong, it says you can't do it and we're just going to say we've been over this for the last four (4) years so we're going to keep on overlooking it? That doesn't sit well with me? I think that we need to make a decision and that's the problem that we've had, is that we can't come to a decision because we want more and more input. We've had all the input we need so I think that we need to actually vote on the issue. So I would be opposed to that and so that's my discussion in opposition to the motion.

Dr. Guillory – okay, we have a motion on the table that we should vote on or else if John wants to withdraw his motion based on Sandy's comments, that's fine too.

Ms. Drummond -- When you made a motion and you second it and it was open for discussion at that point, we typically discuss everything and then make a unanimous motion all that – am I incorrect? Is it not open for discussion right now?

Dr. Guillory -- It's open for discussion, my only concern is that we keep discussing and discussing and we just can not come to an agreement. I think we need to understand that we can not come to any agreement. I don't usually chair this committee and I don't know what to do about that.

Ms. Drummond -- So what I'm asking is does anyone else want to make any points about this motion, or was John prepared to call the question and ask for the vote.

Ms. Hamilton -- I'm not giving you any legal advice as council, I'm simply bringing up one point having to do with the laws? You all follow through with a complaint on people who are interpreting without a license. You are making a distinction, but do you have a basis for making that distinction? Do you have a basis in the law as it stands, for prosecuting some complaints and choosing to ignore others? Something to think about.

Dr. Guillory - I'm not sure I understand what you're saying. Are you saying because we can act on people who do not have a license, that student's fall under that group, they are not licensed and therefore if a complaint were filed, we could act on it based on the fact, or just like we have other individuals who have not been licensed, and that would take care of it?

Ms. Hamilton -- Under that you'd be prosecuting every student. I'm just saying that it's a violation of the law to interpret without a license, so if you are going to take people in the profession that are practicing without a license, are you going to just...

Ms. Durham -- My concern is we already have a reputation out in the community with interpreters and deaf people saying that we never do anything. We get complaints and we don't anything with them, we make no decisions, we have no authority. We need to make a decision. We can't just ignore this.

Dr. Guillory -- Okay, we have a motion on the table, do we have more discussion about doing nothing -- about doing nothing, that's what the motion is about. Do we have more discussion on just that so that we can make a vote or do you want to withdraw your motion, John?

Mr. Adams -- No, I'd like to vote.

Ms. McCray performed a roll call vote

Mr. Adams -- aye

Ms. McEnulty -- no

Ms. Durham -- no

Ms. Drummond -- no

Ms. McCray - no

Because Dr. Guillory seconded the motion while she was acting as chair and no one else seconded the motion, it died for lack of second

Mr. Adams -- I'd like to make a motion to exempt students and I would like to propose the following language: a person is not considered to be interpreting pursuant to provisions of section 209.321, if a person is currently enrolled in an interpreter training program leading to a degree in interpreting at an accredited institution of higher education, provided as such persons engage only in activities and services that constitute a part of a supervised course of study and clearly designated themselves by a title of Student, Practicum Student, Student Interpreter, Trainee, or Intern.

Ms. Durham -- I'll second that.

Dr. Guillory -- Okay, Loretto seconded. Any discussion?

Ms. McCray -- So we're looking at an accredited association as in North Central versus the Conference on Interpreter Training, which they haven't set up their stuff yet?

Mr. Adams -- Since I haven't specified that it must be RID, NCCA, CIT....it just has to hold accreditation.

Ms. McCray -- Program or school?

Mr. Adams -- Institution of higher education, as opposed to the YMCA

Ms. McCray – I was just making sure, because like what Sandy was talking about like some specific institutions like programs that are governed more....I was making the distinction between North Central accrediting the entire school, versus whenever CIT gets their stuff out for accrediting individual programs that train specifically interpreters.

Ms. McNulty-- well, and that's important, how specific is that accredited institution of higher education, within all the programs through out the state.

Ms. Drummond – I have an amendment to make and my amendment would be to add the phrase “enrolled in a interpreter training program as accredited by the Commission on Interpreter Education, which is like the C-C-I-E, the accreditation council that’s been created by the Conference of Interpreter Trainers.”

Ms. McNulty – so say that again, you had MCD in there?

Ms. Drummond – No, it was like the C-C-I-E. I know the acronym but it is like the Commission on....

Ms. McNulty -- I was just asking for clarification.

Ms. Durham - Sandy are you trying to amend John's....

Ms. Drummond – I’m proposing an amendment.

Ms. Durham – I would not second that.

Ms. Drummond – Okay, I just need to know if anyone else would? If no one else seconds it then that amendment dies.

Ms. McCray – So your amendment is to change an accredited....

Ms. Drummond – Well, to add the phrase that the interpreter training program has to be accredited by the national professional organization, the C-C-I-E.

Becky Kilpatrick – I’m the legal council for the department for regulatory matters. One of the reasons I spoke up at this point is because I do look at all legislation that is filed by this department and what was being proposed as an amendment to this motion, to add language specifying an accrediting agency, my suggestion is because accrediting agencies change frequently on national levels, or infrequently it just depends on what ever organization you belong to, that it is a mistake to put that in a statute because it is much more difficult to amend a statute. What you would want to do is put “by an accrediting agency as approved by the committee” so that the committee could then go in and make rules as to which accrediting agencies they would approve for this purpose. And rules are, as we know, while not quick and easy to do, they’re much easier than changing legislation, and that was my suggestion.

Ms. Drummond – I agree, so I withdraw my amendment and so I’m looking for a wording and I see that in other places also...and I’m not sure if it will fit in there, but I would still make that amendment, that we add a phrase that says “the interpreter training program is accredited by a certifying agency that has been approved by the committee as defined by rules.”

Dr. Guillory -- Questions?

Ms. McNulty -- I’m just not sure where you are, Sandy – leading to a degree in interpreting at an accredited institution of higher education as approved by the committee....

Mr. Adams – Right. It would be something like that the actual language isn’t important but that would be included in there somewhere.

Ms. McNulty – Okay. Okay.

Mr. Adams -- I just want to include that language in there somewhere.

Dr. Guillory - I just want to make sure you understand, we're not talking about the committee approving an institution of higher education, you understand that? Because that's what you said. If the committee is approving a certified organization, or an accrediting organization, I guess certifying is the wrong word because those can change. Okay we have that amendment on the floor, do we have a second?

Ms. McCray -- I will second that.

Dr. Guillory -- Okay now, does that 2nd include the motion also?

Becky Kilpatrick -- John would need to amend his motion to agree to the amendment to his motion.

Mr. Adams -- Then I would so move to amend my motion.

(Discussion about amending motion and proper procedures by everyone)

Dr. Guillory -- John do you want to re-state your motion?

Mr. Adams -- I withdraw my first motion and restate that it will be the same motion as before only with the added language that whatever accredited agency is used will be approved by the committee and that will be defined by rule. And that language will be in this as well somewhere which we can discuss at a later date.

Ms. McCray -- I'll still second that.

Dr. Guillory -- Carrie, can we call for the vote or do we need more discussion? Are we done discussing it?

Ms. Durham -- I'm not. My concern is we're going to be getting back to the same problem. We're going to be going over what accrediting agencies are we going to accept. We've already heard from the largest program in Missouri that puts out the largest number of students graduating from the ITP program. They have already expressed concern that if we require them to only get accredited or to add the accreditation on from the Conference of Interpreter Training or whoever else, that it is going to put a financial burden on them. Do we really want to do that to a program that is putting out interpreters that are successful. Can we afford to put that kind of a burden on the program? Is that going to shut the program down? Because I know that the colleges are hurting for funds right now.

Dr. Guillory -- Loretto with regard to that question I need to ask Dan. Dan or anybody else, are there interpreter training programs that are not accredited or certified by some...

Dr Miller -- Can I make a point of information? Caroline Ball came to this committee and clearly indicated that accreditation is a legal term. Recognition is something different. The CIT does not accredit anyone, they don't have accreditation powers. RID does not accredit anyone or anything, nor does NAD. If you've got the word as you have in there "accreditation" that all assumes a vast legal network, and the only group that is going to accredit FVCC is the North Central Accreditation. That's the only group. I don't know why you're wasting time and worrying about this issue, just leave the word accreditation in there and there's all the legal superstructure about it but don't add words that put organizations in there that do not have accreditation powers, such as the CID.

Ms. Drummond -- Let me point out that the words we just added do not state which accreditation agency would be responsible for surveying, providing accreditation, as it stands now we could create a rule that says North Central Accreditation Association and we'd be right where we were before we started. So we can discuss that and there is an accreditation council whether it comes into existence or not in actuality -- the CIT voted in its business meeting last October to create a separate accreditation council based on the CIT standards that they've had published for the last what? Two or three years? They decided that everyone would do self study reviews would be eligible for automatic accreditation, that's supposed to be happening by December of 2003. So you're right, at this moment there is not an accreditation council already established. We would have the authority by rule to make those decisions at some later point if

we felt it was necessary. That's the change here, but there is an accreditation council that actually exists now, it's just not accrediting anyone yet. And again it's not specifically mentioned in that...

Dan Betzler - So the question was we are now accredited by North Central Accreditation, which is the Community college, we would have to ask the community college to then recognize the accrediting tool and then cost would definitely be a factor at this point. I can tell you right now they're looking at trying to keep personnel, okay, that is higher education's whole goal right now, is trying to absorb these cuts from the state without laying anybody off, so that's where they are. I mean, the Chancellor just spoke to use two days ago. So I know that in regard to more accreditation, more monies, it's definitely going to be an issue, I can't say that it isn't, but you're going to have to first make sure that Community College recognizes the accreditation tool and how long the accreditation is going to take, how long does the study take, who is the team, they will research if that team is valid in the profession, and to recognize and hold whatever certification... they'll do all of that before they'll say that that team can come into our institution and look at it. So I know that you are looking at a 5 year process at least, before St Louis Community College would be accredited by CIT, so if you put the wording in, just be ready. I think the same with William Woods and Maple Woods, once you put a specific entity in there they have to research and validate that before they're going to let them in and accredit.

Dr. Guillory -- So John do you want to re-state your motion? Do we have a second? So, we have to vote on it as it stands – do you want to call for the vote?

Ms. McCray -- I'm fine to call for the vote. Do we need to restate the motion so that everyone knows exactly what they're voting on?

Ms. McEnulty -- Yes, do. Loretto did you get your question answered? I mean is it clear for you?

Ms. Durham – Yes it is.

Ms. McCray performed a roll call vote

Ms. Drummond – aye

Mr. Adams – aye

Ms. McEnulty – aye

Ms. Durham – no

Ms. McCray – aye

Ms. McEnulty left at 3:15pm.

Rules

4 CSR 232-3.010 -- A motion was made by Ms. McCray and seconded by Ms. Durham to go ahead and file the final order of rulemaking. Ms. Drummond, Ms. Durham, and Ms. McCray all approved. Mr. Adams voted no.

4 CSR 232-1.035 – Committee reviewed proposed language that was submitted by Ms. Hamilton. A motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. McCray. Ms. Drummond, Mr. Adams, Ms. Durham and Ms. McCray all approved.

Licensure of Deaf Interpreters – *the following is a comprehensive reporting of the discussion regarding licensure of deaf interpreters.*

Mr. Adams – Well for this aren't we just discussing how House Bill 1783 recognizing RID certification CDI, so if a deaf interpreter matches not only our skill level standards if they get a license because they are not, by our definition, interpreting – isn't that what we were discussing?

Ms. Drummond – Yes. I asked for the item to be put on the agenda for the December meeting but we had to table it to this meeting. The reason for that is the passage of HB1783, that it said that the CDI certification, certified deaf interpreter certification, through the RID now has to be recognized by the BCI, and you can go directly to licensing to get a license. So earlier in our meeting we talked about how we

would do that, our application would just say what kind of certification they had, we'd add some line in there they could say 'I have RID, CI/CT'. I am assuming we'd do the same thing for the CDI. The issue before that we were trying to decide was first of all, does the current definition of interpreting in the statute require certification and licensure of deaf people who are interpreting. I believe so far and still our interpretation, that that definition of interpreting that is currently in the statute, does not define what it is that deaf people do when they are interpreting. So that means that...am I correct in thinking that the state committee's interpretation of that is that deaf people are not required to be certified and licensed, according to the interpreting definition in that law now? But HB 1783 says that they can go get a license, which means that would be voluntary. So we can offer licenses to people who are certified deaf interpreters the way it stands now and so then all we'd have to do is make a change to the application.

Ms. McCray – Then we're offering a license to people who technically aren't interpreting?

Mr. Adams – So maybe we change the definition of interpreting and in the packet that I gave out I found in the Illinois Deaf and Hard of Hearing Commission legislation, ours says of spoken or written English concepts, this just says English concepts, period. And so would a deaf person be interpreting or transliterating English concepts to any communication modes of the deaf/hard of hearing consumer? No, if they're interpreting what they see from an interpreter, from a hearing interpreter to another deaf person, they would fall under that category. So, maybe we need to look at coming up with language similar to that, that would apply to CDI's as well. To any CDI, whether RID or any other state has a CDI license or certification or whatnot.

Ms. Drummond – I would agree that the definition of interpreting needs to be changed and maybe that's something that we should also discuss with BCI when we meet with them next. Some of the wording in the old definition is kind of out-dated anyway, but you're right about spoken and written and interpreting and transliterating and those concerns. One of the concerns I would think about the idea of interpreting or transliterating of English concepts is that deaf people may not be interpreting from English concepts to another language. The hearing interpreter that they're working with may be using ASL and not be using English so then....

Mr. Adams – That's why I've also included the standard practice paper from RID of use of the certified deaf interpreter as well as what a certified deaf interpreter is tested on, to see what skills they have for us to review in case we decide to go ahead and try to change the language to help give us a basis for understanding so that we can come up with appropriate language for including deaf interpreters in the interpreting definition.

Ms. Drummond – And I agree with you I'd like to see that happen. My concern is that if we change the definition of interpreting then that would mean that all deaf people are required to be certified and licensed. Right?

Mr. Adams – If they're acting as an interpreter. Which actually that brings up the paragraph above it on that same page the intermediary interpreter a lot of the states that do recognize CDI's have that clause within their rules to differentiate between an interpreter and a CDI by calling it an intermediary interpreter or a certified deaf interpreter or just a deaf interpreter. Then they have their own special definition and included in that definition is the word interpreting, you look up the definition of interpreting you get an idea, so then you say, okay a deaf person – my roommate's sister is deaf and she can read lips, she has residual hearing, so when her family comes to visit and she talks to her brother, who doesn't sign, and then she will interpret for her husband, who is ASL, doesn't hear at all. Is she being an intermediary interpreter? Is that the intention of her act? Is it for everybody or is it for specific assignments where a deaf interpreter will be beneficial, and by adding that definition as well, looking at adding that definition as well to the definitions, might make it a little more clear and might help differentiate it. So it's not every deaf person but it's those people that want to work as a sign language interpreter, as a deaf interpreter. So I don't know if that would be an agenda item or if I'd actually have to make a motion just to put on looking at changing the language.

Dr. Guillory – But the actual definition of interpreting is in the BCI law, right? I mean commission law. So would we just be recommending to them that they...I mean, we're not going to change the language?

Ms. Drummond – I would suggest that we go to the BCI meeting and talk with them about the issue. I mean, technically as Dr Miller pointed out, he could go to the legislature and change it any time he wants, and we could go and change that law any time we want too, but it would be respectful for us to go talk to them first. But yes, I would say that this is something that we should probably visit with them about. I would also ask...I think that we do need to do this and eventually we do need to take care of all this, and I agree with you that the two definitions...my concern is that if we move to a point where we require certification and licensure of deaf interpreters, currently the only way for a deaf person in Missouri to get certification as an interpreter, is through the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf. The cost of that test is exorbitant and it's much greater than it is for hearing people who want to do interpreting in the state of Missouri and I feel like that might cause a problem if there are no alternatives to the RID exam, or at least some way to subsidize it so it doesn't cost so much more than it does for hearing people to get the same eligibility to work. I would like to certainly start exploring this and looking at models for how it would work, I would be concerned about doing what you could to change the actual interpreting definition in the statute right away, of course I think we should talk to the BCI first.

Dr Miller – Couple pieces of information, at the last BCI meeting they agreed to see a task force to explore the CDI question and I have recently appointed that task force and that task force will be discussing trying to deal with what does and what does not need clarified about CDI. Second point, if you look at the language of your laws, the law says "or engaged in the practice of interpreting, needs to be licensed." The definition that's relevant is "engaged in the practice of interpreting". In our law we have two different definitions, I agree with that. There's the definition of an interpreter and the definition of interpreting, and there's the definition of the "practice of interpreting". If you look at the definition for "practice of interpreting" it's clear that that talks about the translation from ASL to spoken English. We've talked about this with the BCI before and my interpretation is that clearly the law right now does not require a deaf person that's translating low functioning deaf signs to ASL, to be in any way licensed, they don't come under this provision. Now where this all got started was because the Office of State Courts Administration, they have their law that they've got to work with. Their law tells them that they can't provide an interpreter who is not certified and licensed. So they, under their law, can't pay a deaf interpreter because the deaf interpreter does not have a license. I think we can deal with all of this without having to change a definition. I don't really understand where this problem is, because you're looking at the wrong definition, it's "engaged in the practice of interpreting", not the definition for interpreting that's relevant.

Ms. Drummond – First of all the committee was concerned because we don't want to give licenses to people that say they can do something that we say they're not doing. In other words, we say that deaf interpreters are not interpreting, so why would we give them a license to interpret? That kind of puts us in an awkward situation but on the other hand the Office of State Courts Administrators refuses to pay deaf interpreters and has basically said you can't use them unless they're certified and licensed, and we don't have anybody in the state of Missouri that's certified and licensed, according to their standards. So should we license someone to do something that we say they're not doing, or should we say we're not going to license anybody, well then no deaf interpreters are available to interpret in court and we need them now. So there's the dilemma, is OSCA going to stand by their requirement that deaf interpreters be certified and licensed? Do you know of any changes in that Dr Miller?

Dr Miller – I don't think that it changes the definition – on this issue, let me say that I think our best approach to trying to solve this issue is to work together to find a reasonable solution and with that in mind Phyllis Lawneos from the Office of State Courts Administrator is on task force to look at the CDI question. I would welcome a representative from the state committee to sit on that task force. I think it's better to have that task force look at this issue, try to figure out, because there's your law, there's their law, theirs our law...rather than each of us individually trying to change our definition and not touch theirs. I think we really need a central effort here to try to solve this problem, and I would welcome you to talk about it and select one of your members to join this task force.

Ms. Drummond – I completely agree with you. I think there should be a representative from the State Committee on that task force, and I think it should be a joint effort. I think it has to be. I think we already said we're going to go to the BCI with that. One of the concerns I have is that there are deaf people who have been working as interpreters in the legal system and have particular clients that they've been working with that have been told since like last September? October? That they're not allowed to work in

the courts any more, they're not getting paid. So they're being effectively denied the right to work, work that they were qualified to do before that they're not being allowed to do now. Have you heard any other decisions from Phyllis Lawneos about the requirements? Does she still require deaf interpreters to have their CDI certificate and a license from the state committee in order to interpret in court?

Dr. Miller – Our law very clearly says that the court administrator will provide an interpreter, that that person has to be certified and licensed.

Ms. Drummond -- So Dr. Miller, are you asking us not to license deaf interpreters at this time?

Dr. Miller – I'm not asking that. I'm saying my interpretation of the wording of our law is that a deaf facilitator...I'll use that word...doesn't have to be licensed because they are not "engaged in the practice of interpreting". But if they want to go into court and get paid they've got to satisfy Phyllis' office, not my office. We're going to try to work out a solution to that problem.

Dan Betzler – That's primarily what I was going to say, that the BCI is trying to determine or at least look into the certified deaf interpreter because they are really stuck right now between a rock and a hard place, they're not able to work without a license, at the same time we have no certification system in place so that they can become certified in the state of Missouri. Those people are really stuck and that is why that task force was formed. I think it would be a good idea to bring it up next week.

Dr. Guillory – That's what I was going to say and next week when we're all together that's another item we need to talk about.

Mr. Adams – I just want to ask is the BCI considering creating a test, a CDI test, or exploring that possibility?

Dan Betzler – Without the money...it comes down to the cost of what it would be to develop that kind of a test.

Mr. Adams – so then I move that this be tabled until the next SCI meeting for further discussion for review of information for those who cannot make the BCI meeting.

Ms. Drummond – I don't know what the procedure is, I would like to object to tabling it. I don't know what the order is. I just want to throw something out. I'm concerned that there have been deaf people who have not been able to work in the courts and if we at least allow the opportunity for people who have a CDI...which I don't know of any...to go ahead and get licensed. It doesn't sound like anybody objects to the idea of allowing the CDI's to be licensed voluntarily, and I don't see a problem with that so we can at least offer that we can discuss, for instance, the definitions that might need to be changed or the requisite skill levels and things like that, and work on that with the task force. But we've already got 1783 that says we can recognize them, we can license them. So I would like to at least vote on that piece of that but then work on the rest of the logistics with the task force.

Dr. Guillory – So how are we licensing them if they don't hold any certification?

Ms. McCray -- We don't. Only if they have the CDI that's from the RID that the BCI has already...

Ms. Drummond – I don't know of any. Now we saw one person today in our meeting that said they'd just taken a written test and so they're obviously getting ready to take the performance test, so we could have one within another 6 months and there may be others. So it's possible that...I know I tend to be slow when it comes to resolving some of these things, so I'm kind of concerned if we let that wait until the other it might be quite a while before we get something set up and we only meet every two months, now someone might be waiting an extra 2 months to work when they wouldn't have to.

Dr. Guillory – So your feeling is we should license them and deal with a lot of the details later?

Mr. Adams – License only the CDIs.

Dr. Guillory – Voluntary, I'm talking about voluntary license if somebody applies for a license to go ahead and grant it.

Ms. McCray – A deaf individual that holds CDI certification.

Dr. Guillory -- CDIs...yes, I didn't say that all but that's what I meant.

Ms. Drummond – Yes, and with the understanding that it is still our interpretation that it is a voluntary...matter...that it's not required, that it's voluntary.

Dr. Guillory – Somebody want to make that motion?

Ms. Drummond – I'll make a motion. Do we have to make a motion? I mean it's already a law? 1783 has already been passed. Do we have to give a license to someone that's been recognized by the BCI?

Ms. Hamilton – You have to look at an application and approve a license if they have met the requirements of your laws. You per 1783 have to recognize those certification levels so if they meet the other requirements for licensure you can license them. As you could anybody who has met the other....

Ms. Drummond – Okay so we don't need to actually make a motion, it's actually done. So all we have to do is change the application form to include CDI's as an option or something like that. So from this point on people who have a CDI's from RID are eligible for licensing and all they have to do is fill out an application like everyone else.

Dr. Guillory -- So we need no action.

Discussion regarding continuing education for interpreters who supervise students. *The following is a comprehensive reporting of the discussion regarding continuing education for interpreters who supervise students.*

Mr. Adams – This should be fairly easy because when we talked about this originally back way before the conference in October, I went out to the MCD website and looked at the rules for applying for CEUs and if I want to I can apply for and get the forms, fill them out and say I will be mentoring this student, this is my plan, this is how many hours I will be putting in, this is what I hope to get out of it and what I need is some feedback, and there's a lot of form to fill out for it but...I mean, it's already out there. So if anybody's interested in supervising students, getting CEUs for it, go to the MCD web site.

Ms. Drummond – In the requirements for the mentorship and qualifying for CEUs, did it say anything about who you were mentoring, like it had to be a licensed interpreter, did it say anything like that, or can they mentor anyone?

Mr. Adams – I honestly don't remember, it was you were going to be mentoring somebody you get CEUs for that but you had to detail your plan for like, what kind of mentorship was going to be used. Was it one on one, was it going to be classroom, were you going to sit with them in front of a TV and watch them interpret, was it going to be real world practice...it was just very detailed. I do remember that part, it requested a lot of information before and that's just the application. MCD can get all of that and then turn around and say, 'I'm sorry this doesn't qualify for what we think a person should earn CEUs, and they can be rejected.

Ms. Drummond – Well I was just curious but in any case that would be if we had any questions or concerns then we could just bring it to the BCI about that, but I don't have any other considerations or questions.

Dr. Guillory – I think that's pretty typical any time anybody applies for CEUs in any profession, they have to give a fairly detailed explanation of what they have to do, what they plan to get out of it and it can either be accepted or rejected.

Reports from MCD and BCI Representative/s

MCD -- Dr. Miller reported that the MCD will meet some time in February but did not have a definite date for the meeting.

BCI - Dr. Miller said that the BCI has not met since the last meeting. He also reported that a CDI task force has been created and that invitations have been sent out. He said Phyllis Lawneos from OSCA has been invited to participate. The next BCI meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 31, 2003 and that SCI will be on the agenda for 1:00pm

Meetings

-Attended

-Upcoming

Friday, January 31, 2003 – BCI meeting and the SCI representative for the CDI meeting will be Sandy Drummond.

The next several SCI meetings have been scheduled as follows:

March 26, 2003, Missouri room, Division of Professional Registration

June 19, 20, 2003 in St Louis, Missouri

August 4, 5, 2003 or August 7, 8, 2003 in Kansas City, Missouri

October 17, 2003 at Tan Tar A, Osage Beach, Missouri.

The meetings in St Louis and Kansas City were decided upon after a suggestion by Mr. Adams to hold town hall meetings in conjunction with the Board meetings which would allow the public to meet and discuss issues with the members of the SCI.

Ms. McCray left at 4:25pm

Report from Executive Director

- Renewals – Ms. Goose reported that renewals are slow to be returned to our office. She said as of January 15, 2003, 343 renewals have not been received. She said that she had requested a second notice to be printed and they would be mailed the following week.
- Newsletter – Ms. Goose indicated that the last SCI newsletter on website and if any one has suggestions or articles for the next newsletter to submit that information to her. Some suggestions for articles that were given to Ms. Goose were HB 1783, July 1st certification level standards, information about the rule that has just been filed and update and create a new flow chart.
- Financial Report – was included for the committee's review.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30pm

Executive Director signature

Date approved by committee

